

**Erratum: Singlet-Triplet Dispersion Reveals Additional Frustration
in the Triangular-Lattice Dimer Compound $\text{Ba}_3\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_8$
[Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 237201 (2008)]**

M. B. Stone, M. D. Lumsden, S. Chang, E. C. Samulon, C. D. Batista, and I. R. Fisher
(Received 21 September 2010; published 14 October 2010)

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.169901](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.169901)

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 99.10.Cd

The sign of two exchange constants, J_1 and J_4 , in the dispersion we presented in [1] which describes the excitations in $\text{Ba}_3\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_8$ was defined incorrectly. The Fourier sum of Eq. (3) of Ref. [1] should be

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{Q}) = -J_1\omega_1 + 2(J_2 - J_3)\omega_2 - J_4\omega_4. \quad (1)$$

The expressions for ω_1 , ω_2 , and ω_4 in the original manuscript are correct. The sign of the quantities in the Fourier sum is corrected in the equation above. The resulting exchange constants are therefore $J_0 = 1.642(3)$, $J_1 = 0.118(2)$, $(J_2 - J_3) = 0.1136(7)$, and $J_4 = 0.037(2)$ meV. J_1 and J_4 were previously reported as being negative. The resulting dispersion, $\hbar\omega(\mathbf{Q})$, of the magnetic excitations does not change due to this error. The only consequence of this change is that the interlayer exchange interactions are in fact antiferromagnetic for $\text{Ba}_3\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_8$. Our other conclusions and results remain unchanged.

The research at Oak Ridge National Laboratory was sponsored by the Scientific User Facilities Division, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, U.S. Department of Energy. This work utilized facilities supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Agreement No. DMR-0454672. Work at Stanford was supported by the National Science Foundation, under Grant No. DMR 0705087.

[1] M. B. Stone *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 237201 (2008).